

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4173

phere of cooperation and mutual understanding.

I am pleased by these recent developments and am hopeful that major labor-management "explosions" over increased automation can be avoided through concerted and sincere efforts along these lines.

I want today to call attention to a forthcoming top-level conference on automation to be held in Cooperstown, N.Y., from June 1 through June 3. It is sponsored by the State of New York and actively championed by Governor Rockefeller. The program for this conference is indeed impressive. Those chosen to address the delegates are among the top people in their respective fields. They include educators, labor leaders, and business executives.

I am certain that all who are able to attend will benefit greatly and that those who are in a position to read and study the various conference reports will find them valuable and enlightening. To this end, I hope in the next few weeks to bring to the attention of the Members various papers and addresses printed in conjunction with the New York State Conference on Automation.

Mr. President, I should like today to ask unanimous consent that an announcement containing the schedule of events to take place at the Cooperstown Conference on Automation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
ALBANY, MAY 10, 1960

Details of the conference on automation which Governor Rockefeller has called in Cooperstown June 1-3 were announced today by the Governor's office. More than 50 leaders in business, labor, education, and government will participate in the discussions. The conference will open with a dinner Wednesday evening, which Governor Rockefeller will address. Three sessions will follow, at which four major aspects of automation will be examined in depth. Paper on each of these aspects will be circulated to the participants in advance of the conference, and will be summarized by the authors at the Thursday and Friday sessions.

The program follows:

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1

Reception and dinner, address by Governor Rockefeller.

THURSDAY, JUNE 2

Morning session: "Automation, Its Meaning and Dimensions," prepared and summarized by John T. Dunlop, professor of economics, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University. Discussion leader, Dr. Thomas Hale Hamilton, president of the State University of New York.

Afternoon session: "Basic Economics of Automation," prepared and summarized by John Diebold, John Diebold & Associates, Inc., management consultants, New York City. Discussion leader, Charles Stauffacher, executive vice president, Continental Can Co.

"Manpower for Automation," prepared and summarized by Eli Ginzberg, professor of economics, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University. Discussion leader, Arthur J. Goldberg, general counsel, United Steel Workers of America.

Dinner: speaker, Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson.

FRIDAY, JUNE 3

Morning session: "The Community and Automation," prepared and summarized by Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers Union of America. Discussion leader, Prof. Frederick Harbison, director, industrial relations section, Princeton University.

Summation: Dr. William J. Ronan, secretary to the Governor.

The conference will conclude with a luncheon Friday noon.

Arrangements for the conference are being handled by a committee composed of Industrial Commissioner M. P. Catherwood, Commerce Commissioner Keith McHugh, and Dr. Ronan.

Primary Boost for Nixon Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Star, May 13, 1960:

PRIMARY BOOST FOR NIXON ELECTION—KENNEDY SEEN WINNING NOMINATION AND DEFEAT BY VICE PRESIDENT

(By David Lawrence)

Analysis of traditional habits in politics and the habits of thought of organization leaders tells far more about who is going to be nominated at a political convention than do polls or primary elections.

Based on just such an analysis this correspondent wrote on March 7, just before the New Hampshire primary, that Senator KENNEDY "is likely to win the Democratic nomination" and that, "if he is blocked, the compromise candidate will be Adlai Stevenson."

On April 7, after the Wisconsin primary, this writer said in these dispatches:

"The Wisconsin primary, by all the rules of politics, should mean that Senator KENNEDY will be regarded as the front-runner from now on. This means that the other candidates will tend to combine against him. There are other primary contests, to be sure, but Senator KENNEDY will gain ground in all of them, as he has the organization and the finances back of him to win the necessary delegate strength.

What is really meant by "the organization and the finances"? Certainly there is not the slightest basis for any implication that votes are bought. Nor is it to be assumed that the word "organization" means the regular party machinery. In pre-convention campaigns, each candidate develops his own organization and, if he has money enough, he will engage precinct workers everywhere to get voters to the polls, transporting them in autos when necessary. More important still, the organization will know where to find the indifferent voters who can be persuaded by friends to vote for the candidate such friends favor.

These "organization" workers carry sample ballots printed in advance, and in a State like West Virginia, where there are few precincts with voting machines, it means that the citizen takes the sample ballot into the voting booth and is not bewildered when confronted with a long list of State and local candidates. He is enabled to go right to the spot on the ballot and put his mark down.

This is an old pattern in American politics, and it takes a lot of money to pay for a big organization that really gets out the vote. The total Kennedy vote in West Virginia was about 220,000, which is less than half the Democratic vote cast for Adlai Stevenson in 1952, when he carried the State against General Eisenhower. It isn't difficult to line up a minority bloc in any State primary if you have the money and the organization. The Kennedy forces can do it hereafter in every primary, and they will confront the Democratic National Convention with the legitimate query: "Since we have won most of the primaries, how can you turn us down?"

This correspondent believes the West Virginia primary result not only has helped Senator KENNEDY toward the Democratic nomination but actually has helped toward the election of Vice President Nixon, who is certain to be the Republican nominee.

Once the so-called religious issue is out of the way—and it now will be so viewed by many politicians because West Virginia has a relatively small number of Catholics in its voting population—the tendency will be to appraise the Massachusetts Senator on his merits.

The Republican strategists, for instance, don't want to see the religious issue raised, either. They would rather go before the country with the argument that, in these fateful times, "You don't elect a boy to be President of the United States."

The biggest point the Republicans think they will have in their favor is that Vice President NIXON is trained in and intimately familiar with the tasks of the White House and that Senator KENNEDY would have to start from scratch to learn how to function in the Presidency.

But doesn't the voting in the primaries, it will be asked, indicate that Senator KENNEDY is popular and a good vote-getter? As against a less colorful and less known candidate, such as Senator HUMPHREY, it has not been difficult for Senator KENNEDY to win the primaries thus far. But the real reason the Massachusetts Senator upset so many observers who were forecasting the outcome of the West Virginia primaries is that they paid more attention to hit-or-miss polls than to two key factors—"the organization and the finances."

In a national election, "the organization and the finances" tend to be balanced as between the parties. As of today, it seems very likely that the Nation's voters will have to choose between Senator KENNEDY and Mr. NIXON next November. This writer believes that—on the basis of, first, satisfactory economic conditions in the major part of the country next autumn, and, second, the argument as to the executive experience that the Republican nominee will offer to the public, and, third, the active support of President Eisenhower—the Republicans will win a decisive victory.

Statement of Hon. Robert Lovett to National Policy Machinery Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, earlier in this session, Robert A. Lovett testified before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, of which Senator

May 17

A4174

JACKSON is chairman, and of which I have the honor to be a member. This testimony attracted widespread interest and comment when it was subsequently released, but a number of articles published subsequently interpreted certain comments of Mr. Lovett as being critical of President Eisenhower. In order to make clear that Mr. Lovett's testimony was both in word and intent directed at the institution of the Presidency and not at President Eisenhower personally, Senator MUNDT, ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, wrote Mr. Lovett and received a reply making this intent completely clear.

I ask unanimous consent that the exchange of correspondence between Senator MUNDT and Mr. Lovett, and an article on the subject by Arthur Krock printed in the New York Times of April 14, 1960, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 30, 1960.

Mr. ROBERT LOVETT,
Brown Bros., Harriman & Co.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR Mr. LOVETT: During March you graciously appeared as the leadoff witness before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, of which I am a member. At the close of your appearance, the subcommittee went into executive session to receive your comments on the operations of the National Security Council.

Throughout your discussion of the NSC you referred to "the President." At the time, it was my impression that you were analyzing the position of president. Subsequent published articles have been based on the assumption that you described the activities of the present incumbent of the Presidency, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

One of these articles was a column by Mr. Walter Lippmann on March 1. Several days later I attempted to clarify the matter through a statement for the RECORD. Attached is a copy.

Unfortunately my clarification statement seems to have clarified nothing. Your testimony still is being interpreted as applying to President Eisenhower. I would appreciate very much having a short note from you as to the meaning you intended to give the phrase "the President" in your executive testimony. I hope to insert it in the committee record.

Again may I say that your basic statement before our subcommittee was most interesting and pertinent. With kindest regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senator.

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
New York, N.Y., April 4, 1960.
Senator KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: On my return to the office today from the Pacific coast, I found awaiting me your letter of March 31 requesting clarification of the meaning of certain language in my comments on the National Security Council given in executive session before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery.

You are correct in your understanding that my use of the expression "the President" meant "a President," or "any President," and not specifically the present incumbent. I have made this same answer to Gordon Gray, special assistant to the President, who made

the same inquiry of me by telephone while I was in California.

You will recall that, in my opening statement, I said (last sentence, p. 12, of the subcommittee printed record, pt. 1) that "It should be clear, therefore, that none of these observations is intended to be critical of any individuals or of operational decisions." The few paragraphs I had written dealing with NSC were excised from my public statement and were given in executive session in accordance, I am informed, with the terms of an understanding reached at the request of the White House regarding the handling in executive session of questions on NSC matters. The sentence quoted above naturally applies, as you rightly understood, to all my testimony in both open and executive sessions.

In view of the public interest shown in the subcommittee's hearings, it is not surprising to find some agencies or individuals who feel that the shoe might fit. I know of no way to keep them from trying it on for size.

With my thanks for your kind letter and cordial personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

HOW TO MAKE A SHOE FIT ANY FOOT (By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—Since Robert A. Lovett testified before Senator JACKSON's subcommittee several weeks ago, the impression has been growing that he definitely subscribed to some of the harshest criticisms of President Eisenhower and the National Security Council in their mutual relationship. Some news dispatches and analyses of Lovett's testimony, and a Senate speech by Senator FULBRIGHT, are important sources of this public understanding.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee concluded that the former Secretary of Defense "indicated that the President (meaning Eisenhower) leads a dangerously sheltered life as Chief Executive." Also, that Lovett "said . . . the NSC protects Mr. Eisenhower from the debates that precede policy decisions."

The transcript of Lovett's testimony, both in open and executive session, does not establish either of these conclusions, or the assumptions in the press that when Lovett referred to "the" President, he always meant Eisenhower. What the transcript does establish is this:

1. At the outset of his testimony Lovett stated a caveat. It was that his remarks would be "based for the most part on notes made" during the Truman administration, and that he intended "no direct reference to any individuals or specific decisions."

2. But he did not regularly repeat this caveat. Therefore, when he answered, and agreed with, questions about "NSC procedures" and "the President," so phrased they could have been taken to apply to the Eisenhower tenure, it was possible to assume that the witness replied in kind.

3. But close inspection of the transcript shows that the former Secretary of Defense conceived he was discussing "a" President and the National Security Council as an institution, and he has since said as much. Apparently he relied on his opening caveat to prevent hypothetical exchanges in executive session from being interpreted as applying specifically to Eisenhower and the current procedures of the National Security Council.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following are such exchanges:

Mr. JACKSON. Do you think the Security Council can operate effectively, as it was designed originally, if you have a large number of participants?

Mr. LOVETT. I would have very great doubts about its ability to operate in a mass atmosphere. I think it would inhibit fair discussion . . . [and] be an embarrassment as regards the vigor with which a man might want to defend his position. I think it would limit the quality of the debate which the President ought to hear.

Mr. JACKSON. You do not necessarily lighten the load of the President by bringing to him agreed-upon papers where no decision is involved, other than to say, "We will go ahead with this." Don't you think there is confusion on the point that there is a tendency to help the President, to lighten his load, by trying to do his constitutional work for him?

Mr. LOVETT. I think the President in his own protection must insist on being informed and not merely protected by his aides, [it being] a tendency of younger assistant . . . to try to keep the bothersome problems away from the senior's desk.

Probably it was because the witness did not steadily invoke his caveat, like takers of the fifth amendment before racket inquiries, that many concluded Lovett had conceded the points of criticism involved as currently applicable. But if he fears that President Eisenhower's temperament, his military preference for having issues intensely screened for him, and his awesome renown, inevitably have diluted the essential concept and function of the National Security Council in this administration, Lovett neither "said" nor "indicated" this. And the National Security Council's statistical record—of the President in the chair at 90 percent of the National Security Council meetings, sharp debates in his presence over fundamental differences in policy papers—refutes many assumptions on which major criticisms are founded.

Tribute to the Eagle Rock Sentinel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1960

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the 24th Congressional District of California, which it is my privilege to represent in Congress, possesses a number of top quality local newspapers which make an important contribution to the district in reporting news of special interest to the community, expressing area views on matters affecting it, undertaking crusades in behalf of the community where its interest is concerned, and generally performing many other valuable services in behalf of the residents of the community. The 24th district is very fortunate to have these public-spirited institutions.

One of the fine community newspapers serving the 24th District, the Eagle Rock Sentinel, is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. The Sentinel is a source of pride to the district and I wish to add my heartiest congratulations on this important occasion.

There was no doubt as to what kind of newspaper the Sentinel was to be from the very beginning. When it first appeared, in March 1910, the Sentinel announced that it would defy the then existing trend toward journalistic sen-